VoLNo 8958

[illegible]

VOL- 8958

மதுரை மாவட்ட
ஆட்சியர் ஆவணம்

VOL. NO- 8958
G. NO- 30088

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர் ஸ்ரீ சாந்தகுமாரி

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுக்கக்
கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 4/2002

செப்பனிட்டு முடிக்க நாள் 7/2002.

18/7/02
சரிபார்க்கும் மு.நி.பா.எ. கையொப்பம் 24/7/02
19/8/02

21

of paper for
received

ishop
ived

tion of — Informing that the parties of
Velankattoor have not appeared
ore — before the Tahsildar of Puttucottah
for settling a boundary dispute
between Velankattoor and Nuniyoor
and requesting to order the Amin
at once to send such of the persons
wanted by the Tahsildar.

2 Informing that the village of
/9 901 Collec Poodukolam in the zemindari
Tim Perungal now under dispute
enjoyed by the zemindar of
omitted and belongs only

Forwarding a copy of a
prepared by the Special
/1136 Collector Collector after a personal
ion the question of a
between Ram

			Subs
/12	159	of Trichinopoly	Requesting respect of Government of the whole Marunga district he has transfer.

35 v 53

N 286 Tanjore 5

Chetoobavah 26th April 1855

R

To

The Political Agent
for Poodoocottah
Madura

Sir

The Tahsildar of Puttoocottah reports, that in consequence of the non attendance of some parties from Valancattoor, he is not able to settle the boundary dispute between the meerassdars of that village, & tho
of Nimyore in this district - I have therefore the honor to request that the Ameen at Oroor may be instructed to send those who the Tahsildar may require for the purpose

I take this opportunity also to reques
that you will, should there be no objectio
instruct the Ameen to attend to similar

requisitions from the Tahsildar whenever he may have occasion to make them – as a means of obviating delay and needless correspondence.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obed^t Servt
Collector

Filed

[illegible]
Forwarded with Copy of [illegible]
21 Sept 55

No. 981.

4

Tinnevelly Tencausey
13th September 1855

9

From
C. J. Bird Esqre.
Collector

To
R. D. Parker Esqre.
Collector of
Madura

Sir,

With reference to your letter of 12th May last No 461, I have the honor to forward copy of an Urzee from the Tahsildar of Streevillypootoor Talook dated 5th Instt. from which it appears that Poodoocolum under dispute is a Manium Village attached to the Zemindary of Paryoor in this District and is enjoyed by the Zemindar of Vadeemittah who rented it on condition of paying 30 Collums of grain to the Soobramonia Swamy Pagoda in the said place, that his right to the enjoyment of the same was

disputed

disputed both by the people of the Pagoda and the Zemindar of Pa:-ryoor at different times and the matter was settled in his favor on the 1st occasion by a razeena-:mah entered into by both parties and on the latter with reference to the same document and that the whole extent of land which on measurement amounted to $\overset{ll\ m\ s}{62\text{-}6\text{-}2\tfrac{1}{2}}$ agrees exactly with that entered in the Atadoogoo account of the Village in the possession of the Curnum.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servt.

Tinnevelly
Tincauvey
13th Septr. 1855

E. F. Bird
Collector

No. 1445
1855

From
Collector of
Tinnevelly

Dated 13th Septr. /55.

One Enclosure

R 34

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 342 [illegible] 376 [illegible]

[illegible] 29 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 11 [illegible]

[illegible] 57 [illegible] 57 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2 [illegible] 30 [illegible] 1807 [illegible]

5A

13

[illegible] 30 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1829 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1829 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1827 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1882 [illegible]

802 [illegible]

[illegible] 30 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 883 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1854 [illegible]
385 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 75.
[illegible] 2 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 57 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 57 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1807 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1829 [illegible] 275 [illegible] 2 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] 1832ம்

[illegible] 883 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2[illegible] [illegible] 21 [illegible]

[illegible] 32 [illegible] 402 [illegible]

[illegible] 883 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

[illegible]

1855ம்

ஜனவரி 5உ

[illegible]

[illegible]

ஸ்ரீ [illegible]

(Signed) Ramasawmy Iyer
Ag. Tahsildar

(True Copy)

[illegible]
Collector

25-11-55

No 1036. Tanjore 7

Tillum 23rd November 1855

To

The Collector

of Madura

R

Sir,

Referring to your letters of the 24th May 1854 & 24th April 1855, and to mine of the 26th April 1855, I have now the honor to send to you a copy of a memorandum prepared by the Special Assistant Collector after a personal enquiry into the question of a disputed boundary between Ramnad, & Puttoocottah of Tanjore

16th Novr. 1855

I am of opinion that Mr. Norman successfully shows that the claim of the villagers of this Province is valid, and if you should be able to coincide in that view, I have to request that you will give orders accordingly.-

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. Servt.

Collector

Memorandum relative to a boundary dispute between the villages of Ninnyur in the Putthukottai Talook of the Tanjore district and Valankattin in the Ramna Zamindary attached to the Madura district

1. In 1851 the Rani of the Ramn Zemindary addressed a petition to the Collector of Madura complaining (1) that the Ryots of Ninnyur and other villages in Tanjore had encroached on the land belonging to the villag of Valankattin (2) that they had destroyed a certain channel belonging to the latter village (3) that they had taken up and concealed certain boundary stones making the respective boundaries of the Ramn and Tanjore territory.

2 The Collector of Madura ha
ving made a reference to the Collector
of Tanjore, the latter officer ordered
the Pattukottai Tahsildar to examine
the spot and report.

3 On December 19th 1851 the Pat
tukottai Tahsildar reported that the
Ryots of the two villages had written
a Muchilkah stating their mutual
willingness to abide by an official
decision: and that though it appeared
that* the Ninniyur people had been
n enjoyment of the disputed piece
f land for 20 or 25 years he had ne-
vertheless measured it and he forward
d the result of his measurements,
hich was favorable to the Ninniyur
Ryots

The Pattukottai Tahsildar
gain subsequently reported that he

had inspected the accounts brought
forward by the Ramnad people an
that they were mostly so decayed th
nothing definite could be learnt
from them. Also that the Ramnad
Officials declined admitting the
Paimash Accounts of F. 1238 as con-
clusive, because they had, they said
been drawn up during the absence
of the Valankattu Ryots. But the
admitted the genuineness of the Accou
of Fuslies 1210 and 1225 and expressed
their readiness to abide by them.

As to the Boundary stones, th
Tahsildar reported that they had al
disappeared but two on which the ma
cut were different so that their authen-
ticity was doubtful. The Tahsildar
concluded by requesting Copies of
the Pymash Accounts of F/10.

5. These accounts were then procured and an order sent to the Tahsildar to inspect the spot with the accounts.

This was done-

6 In September 1852, one Ramchu-aiyan of Vettivayel, a Tanjore village, complained against Vartunadu Ayan of Pappakudi another Tanjore village to the effect that the latter had pulled up a stone forming the boundary between Vettivayal and Pappakudi two Tanjore villages. This stone also forming the boundary between the Ramnad Village of Valankattur and the 2 Tanjore villages above mentioned. The Ramnad Ryots bring this forward as an argument against their opponents. But the Tahsildar having fully investigated the case declared his opinion that no

case could be in any way established against Vartinadayan and Mr Morris, the then Ag. Spl. Assistant Collector agreed with the Head of Police and dismissed the plaint. Consequently nothing can be proved in any way affecting the claims of either party from the fact of this plaint.

7. Various delays took place after this. But the Tahsildar mad a report on the case in December 15th 1854 and I have since gone over the whole of the ground said by the Ramnad Ryots to have been taken from them.

8 As the Ramnad Ryots refused to come into the Tanjore Territory without an order from the Ram that order was obtained and the Puttukottei Tahsildar furnished

the enquiry and made his final report
stating his opinion as follows.
1. The Ramnad Ryots have no
written documents to support their
claim 2. The Pymash accounts of F.
1225. by which the Ramnad people said
they would abide, are in favor of the
Tanjoreans: all the disputed land
being entered in those accounts as
elonging to Tanjore with the exception
f $\overset{m}{16}.\overset{G}{32}$ in Vettivayel and $\overset{m}{7}.\overset{G}{9}$ in
tunnyur. 3. The Valangattu people
ay their "Kal Mali" accounts
rove the land belonging to them.
But as above said the stones are not
n existence
4. My opinion is decidedly in favor
f the Tanjore people for the following
easons.
The Ramnad people have literally

no written evidence in support of their claim. The "Hal Mabi" account on which they lay so much stress, is entirely useless. Neither Boundaries of fields nor Numbers of fields are specified in it, so that it is impossible to tell what the items refer to

innyur 2. Of the disputed land now in the occupation of the Ninnyur people, $\overset{v}{1}.\overset{m}{13}.\overset{g}{5}$ is entered in the Pymash accounts of that village as Ninnyur and $\overset{v}{1}-\overset{m}{9}-\overset{g}{29}$ as Anadi Tari. $\overset{m}{7}.\overset{g}{9}$ is not entered Number wise in the Pymash Accounts but it is within the Boundaries of the village as shewn by those accounts.

apakudi Of the land said to have been usurped by the Papakudi village viz $\overset{v}{2}.\overset{m}{19}.\overset{g}{59\frac{1}{4}}$ all is entered as Ningri Anadi Tari in the Pymash Accounts of that village -

Of the land said to have been frau- Vetti
dulently assumed by the Vettivayal
Ryots, 16. ^{m} 32^{G} is now cultivated by them.
though this land is not entered num-
bered in the Pymash Accounts, yet
t is within the boundaries of the vil-
lage as specified in those accounts.
ny how the Vettivayal people have
he right of present possession -

Again of the disputed land in
his village 8-^{m}72^{G}$\frac{9}{16}$ is entered in the
ymash Accounts of the village as
Nunjei Anadi Tarw

Of the land said to have been Venn
taken by Vennathur (Ilanjore) from
alankattur, all viz 2.^{v} 3^{m} 86¼^{G} is entered
 the Vennattur Pymash Accounts
s Punjei Anadi Tarw.

The amount said to have been taken Vennam by this village amounts to $\overset{V}{2}$. $\overset{M}{9}$ $\overset{G}{89\frac{3}{8}}$. This is entered in the Pymaish accounts of the village as Punjee Anaide Tarw

Summary

Thus, the whole of the disputed land is entered in the Tanjore Pymaish accounts except $\overset{M}{16}$. $\overset{G}{32}$ in Vettiryal and $\overset{M}{7}$ $\overset{G}{9}$ in Ninnyan. But these two lots of land are enclosed in the village Boundaries as given in those accounts, though not given Number war again all that is cultivated of the disputed land is cultivated and has been as far as can be ascertained for many years by the Tanjore Ryots. And it seem had the Valankattin Ryots a valid claim they would have resisted when the Ninnyan people first cultivate the land (The Ramnad people dont dispute the fact of possession by the Tanjore people) so that an order wil be sent to the Tahsildar to take measures that the Nunnyur &c. (Tanjore) people continue as heretofore in the undisturbed enjoyment of their cultivated land and that the Valankattur Ryots must have recourse to a Civil suit to oust them - also, as the enjoyment of the waste must be given to some person till the final decision is given to, and as the waste land being entered in the Pymash accounts of Tanjore is very strong prima facie evidence that it belongs to that province an order will be sent to put and to keep the Ryots of the villages in whose accounts the portions appear, in possession of them, should they desire to cultivate them.

10 I could not discover that the channel said to have been destroyed by the Tanjore people had been so destroyed. Indeed the Ramnad people did not

seem certain where the channel in questi
was -

11. I may add that the uncultivated part of the disputed land is an open bare plain and there are no rocks, channels, trees, or any other natural marks to help you to form any certain idea from them, where the boundary might have been -

A Copy of the order to the Pattukottei Tahsildar, will be sent to the Collector with this Memorandum

Mannargoody
16th November 1855

(Signed) M. Norman
Ag. Spl. Asst Collr.

(True Copy)

Collector

Compd

Answered 27 Decr 1855

24-12-55

14

R (31)

Trichinopoly Collr Office
21st December 1855.

No. 159

From,
J Bird Esquire
Collector of Trichinopoly

To,
R. D. Parker Esquire
Collector of Madura

Sir,

1. Adverting to the Circul
from the Board of Revenue No. 3246, with
Extract from their Proceedings Dated th
6th Instant transmitting Extract from th
Minutes of Consultation of the 26th Novemb
1855, I have the honor to solicit your s
=timents in respect of the proposal of Gove*
=ment for the transfer of the whole of you
Talook of Marangapoory to this Distri

* Vide Lar 7

2. As far as I am Concerned pe
=sonally I have no objection to urge agains
the addition to my Charge. There is muc
force in the observations of Government re
=garding the Convenience to the people in
being brought nearer to the Courts and to
the head quarters of the Collector. And
since the removal of the Talook Cutch=
=erry to "Manapara", the distance from

thence

thence to my Cutchery must be about twenty Miles - While to your Sub Collectors station at Dindigul it must be nearly double that -

With reference to the detached parts of this District noticed by the Go- Para
vernment as wholly surrounded by your Collectrate, I observe the Gazetteer Map of Meſsrs Pharoah & Co. has misled the Government inasmuch as the Ma-
iaganum of Kōſacoorchi was transferred to Madura in 1817 by Mr Travers the then Collector of this Soobah -

On the receipt of your Sentiments I shall be prepared to addreſs the Board of Revenue.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servt

Bird
Collector

Trichinopoly
Collr. Office
21st Decr 1855

To
R.C. Parker Esqr
Collector of
Madura.